DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 461 UD 022 056

AUTHOR Iwanicki, Edward F.; Gable, Robert K.
TITLE The Hartford Project Concern Program: A Synthesis of the Evaluation Findings from 1976-1980.
INSTITUTION Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Busing; *Career Choice; Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Inner City; Mathematics Achievement; Parent Attitudes; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Reading Achievement; School Desegregation; State Programs; *Student Attitudes; *Student Attrition; Suburban Schools; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Hartford Public Schools CT

ABSTRACT

Project Concern is an experiment in educational intervention for children in those Hartford, Connecticut schools under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Begun in September, 1966, the program aims to achieve school desegregation objectives by busing Hartford students to schools in the suburbs and by busing students from schools in less economically disadvantaged areas to schools within the Hartford inner-city area. This report synthesizes findings from program evaluation over the period 1976-1980. Evaluation results are presented on: (1) program impact on students' academic achievement in Grades 3, 5, and 7; (2) program impact on students' attitudes toward school and their peers; (3) career choices and career patterns of Project Concern graduates; (4) factors associated with student attrition in the program; and (5) the attitudes of parents and teachers toward the program. Appropriate comparisons are made between (1) suburban Project Concern participants; (2) in-city program participants; (3) the classroom peers of suburban program participants; and (4) Hartford students who are not participating in the program. The findings provide evidence of gains in student learning, positive student attitudes, higher career aspirations, and more consistent career patterns among program participants. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219461

THE HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

A Synthesis of the Evaluation Findings from 1976-1980

Prepared by:

Edward F. Iwanicki

Robert K. Gable

University of Connecticut

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDWARD F. IWANICKI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Presented to:

The Hartford Public Schools

May 1981

UD022056

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
I	IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT LEARNING	5
	Background	5
	Design of This Follow-up Study	5
	Selection Process Used to Identify the Samples Being Studied	7
	Instrumentation and Treatment of the Data	8
	Findings	9
	AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTS OF THE IN-CITY COMPONENT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT LEARNING	17
	Findings	19
	MONITORING THE BASIC SKILL PERFORMANCE OF SUBURBAN PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS	25
	GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT LEARNING	28
II	IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT ATTITUDES	30
	Background	30
	The Design of This Assessment	31
	Instrumentation	32
	Analysis of the Interview Results	33
	Findings...General Views of In-City Concern, Hartford Comparison, In-City Peer, and Suburban Concern Students Toward Their School Experience	33
	In-City Peers' Views of In-City Concern Participants	35
	Hartford Comparison Student Views of the Project Concern Program	35
	Comparison of In-City Project Concern Participant Views of Their School Experience to the Views of the Other Groups Studied	36
	In-City Versus Suburban Participants' Views of Project Concern	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

SECTION		Page
	A Cautionary Note on the Use of Student Survey Results	38
	Suburban Peers Views of Concern Participants	39
	Suburban Project Concern Participants' and Classroom Peers' Attitudes Toward School	40
	MONITORING THE ATTITUDES OF PROJECT CONCERN PART PARTICIPANTS	41
	GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT ATTITUDES	44
III	CAREER PATTERNS OF PROJECT CONCERN GRADUATES	45
	Background	45
	Research Design and Data Analysis	45
	Findings	48
IV	FACTORS ACCOUNTING FOR STUDENT ATTRITION FROM PROJECT CONCERN	50
	Background	50
	Design and Implementation of the 1979-1980 Attrition Study	50
	Results of the Attrition Study	51
V	HARTFORD PARENTS' ATTRITION TOWARD PROJECT CONCERN	56
	Background	56
	Design of the Parent Survey	56
	Views of Parents of Non-Participating Students	61
	Cautions in the Interpretation of the Results of This Survey of Hartford Parents	63
VI	SUBURBAN PARENTS' AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PROJECT CONCERN	65
	Background	65
	Findings of the Parent Questionnaire	65
	Suburban Parent Views of the Personal Relationships Between Suburban and Project Concern Children	66
	Suburban Parent Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern	68
	Suburban Teachers' Attitudes Toward Project Concern	69

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

SECTION		Page
	Suburban Teachers' Ratings of Concern Pupil Progress	69
	Suburban Teachers' Views of the Influence of Project Concern Children on Suburban Children	70
	Suburban Teachers' Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern	71
	Suburban Teachers' Views of Areas Where the Project Concern Program Can Be Improved	74
	Limitations of the Reported Perceptions of Suburban Parents and Teachers Toward Project Concern	75
	CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE USE OF THIS FIVE YEAR SYNTHESIS OF PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION FINDINGS	76

Background

The Hartford Project Concern Program began in September of 1966 as an experiment in educational intervention for children from Title I schools concentrated in the north end of Hartford.[1] Receiving support from many areas (State of Connecticut Department of Education, The Hartford Board of Education, The Hartford Court of Common Council, The Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, The Urban League, Community Renewal Team, The NAACP, The Alliance of Ministers, The PTA, The Archdiocese of Hartford, parents, Boards of Education from the five original participating communities, administrators, teachers, members of the legislature, and religious leaders other than the Alliance of Ministers or the Archdiocese of Hartford), the project developed seven objectives in the original application to the Federal Government for funds under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These objectives were as follows:

1. To develop a structure between a city and its suburbs that will desegregate schools.

2. To discover the attitudes of children, parents, educators, and the community when city children are bussed to the suburbs.

3. To learn what happens to the educational achievement of both city and suburban children when city children go to suburban schools.

4. To find out what social activities city children can participate in when they go to school in the suburbs.

5. To encourage Connecticut towns to think about desegregation of schools in regional terms.

---

[1] Information relating to the history and enrollment status of Project Concern was obtained from project materials.

6. To train school administrators, teachers, and aides for integrated schools.

7. To find out what communities can do to make bussing effective.

From 1966 to the present, participation of suburban communities has increased from five communities (265 children attending 35 schools) to thirteen communities with 1,052 students attending 72 schools. In addition, during the 1980-1981 school year 255 students are attending five inner-city schools in the south end of Hartford. Although the non-public school component of Project Concern was discontinued at the conclusion of the 1979-1980 school year, these non-public schools agreed to allow students who were enrolled through Project Concern to continue their studies tuition free, provided these students could still ride the Project Concern buses. During the 1980-1981 school year, 54 Hartford students are attending six non-public schools in four communities on a tuition free basis.

As the Project Concern program has grown, so have the inquiries regarding its effectiveness. More specifically, school boards, educators, and citizens in participating communities have been asking whether Project Concern is successful from an educational standpoint. The difficulty in answering this question lies in defining the term "successful". Some accept the ability of students of differing races to interact effectively as evidence of the success of Project Concern. Others seek measures of cognitive and affective test growth as evidence of program success.

As the first decade of the Project Concern Program was coming to

a close, the Capitol Region Education Council convened a meeting of the Project Concern Advisory Committee in the spring of 1975 to discuss potential directions which could be pursued in evaluating Project Concern. The Project Concern Advisory Committee is the policy making group for the program consisting of school board members and administrators from communities participating in the program. The Advisory Committee decided it would be beneficial to evaluate Project more systematically and that Connecticut State Department of Education funds whould be obtained to support this effort. Also, an Evaluation Task Force was appointed to obtain the services of an evaluation consultant and to work with this consultant in the development of a design for the evaluation of Project Concern.

Even with the generous support of the Connecticut State Department of Education, it was soon evident that the questions being raised about Project Concern could not be addressed through a single evaluation effort. Thus, the Advisory Committee decided that the evaluation of Project Concern would be a continuous process. Each year crucial issues regarding the program would be identified and prioritized. Depending on the level of funding available, higher priority issues would be examined through the evaluation process.

Since the decision of the Advisory Committee in 1975 to evaluate Project Concern more systematically, several aspects of the program have been examined. Two in-depth inquiries into the impact of Project Concern for the suburban, non-public and inner-city components were initiated during the 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 school years when the Capitol Region Education Council received grants from the Connecticut

State Department of Education. Information regarding the design and results of these two evaluations is presented in the 1975-1976 Hartford Project Concern Evaluation Report (Iwanicki, 1976) and An Evaluation of the 1976-1977 Hartford Project Concern Program (Iwanicki and Gable, 1977). Further, during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 project years an evaluation of the cognitive and affective growth of students in the suburban component was conducted (see An Evaluation of the 1977-1978 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1978 and Final Evaluation Report 1978-1979 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1979). During the 1979-1980 project year, the evaluation focused on the career patterns of Project Concern graduates as well as the factors accounting for student attrition in the program. (see Final Evaluation Report 1979-1980 Hartford Project Concern Program)

Much has been learned about Project Concern through these evaluation efforts over the past five years. This synthesis of evaluation findings has been prepared to facilitate policy makers' access to this information as decisions are made regarding the future direction of Project Concern. In developing this synthesis, the results of past evaluations have been grouped and will be presented as they relate to the following issues:

I. Impact of Project Concern on Student Learning

II. Impact of Project Concern on Student Attitudes

III. Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates

IV. Factors Accounting for Student Attrition in Project Concern

V. Hartford Parents' Attitudes Toward Project Concern

VI. Suburban Parents' and Teachers' Attitudes Toward Project Concern

I. IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT LEARNING

Background

One of the more thorough evaluations of the impact of Project Concern on student learning was conducted during the 1976-1977 school year. This investigation was a follow-up study of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of students who participated in the 1975-1976 Project Concern evaluation. The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Suburban, Project Concern, and Hartford students who participated in the 1975-1976 evaluation of Project Concern was assessed over a short period of time (3-5 months) due to delays in testing. During the 1976-1977 school year, a follow-up evaluation of these students was conducted to assess their reading growth over a longer period of time. Such long term information would provide more accurate information for assessing the effects of the Project Concern Program on reading growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. Thus, those students who comprised the evaluation samples studied during the 1975-1976 school year were tested again in April 1977 to obtain an estimate of their Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth over a period of one year (May 1976-April 1977).

Design of This Follow-up Study

The basic questions investigated in this follow-up study were the same as those posed by communities participating in the 1975-1976 Evaluation of Project Concern. The primary question examined was as

follows:

(1) What Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth have suburban classroom peers, Project Concern participants, and Hartford students exhibited over the past year?

In addition, the following secondary questions were examined?

(2) Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of their suburban classroom peers?

(3) Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of those students who have remained in Hartford?

In addressing these questions during the 1975-1976 Evaluation of Project Concern, the three groups of students studied were defined as follows:

(1) Project Concern Participants - those Hartford students attending public schools in the suburbs through the Project Concern Program.

(2) Suburban Classroom Peers - those suburban students being instructed in the same classrooms as the Project Concern participants.

(3) Hartford Students - those students being instructed in Hartford who meet the eligibility criteria for participation in Project Concern.

For the purposes of this follow-up study the same definitions held true with the exception of the suburban classroom peers. In some situations suburban classroom peers may have moved into classrooms during the next school year where there were no Project Concern students.

Given these three student groups, reading growth was assessed using a basic pretest-post test research design. The same random

sample of students from each group who were administered the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test at grades 2, 4, and 6 in May 1976 were tested again at grades 3, 5, and 7 in April 1977. For this follow-up study, the May 1976 results served as the pretest while the April 1977 results served as a post test.

Selection Process Used to Identify the Samples Being Studied

As mentioned earlier, the samples being examined in this follow-up study were selected during the 1975-1976 Evaluation of Project Concern. At that time random samples of Project Concern participants, Suburban classroom peers, and Hartford students were drawn at grades 2, 4, and 6. The specific processes used to identify these samples at that time are discussed in the subsequent paragraphs.

In order to be sure that the reading growth of Project Concern students was representative of the students participating in the program, a random sample of 80 students was selected at grades 2, 4, and 6. These students were selected from the total population of public school students participating in the suburban Project Concern Program as of November 1, 1976.

In assessing suburban classroom peer growth, it was also important for this growth to be representative of the reading growth of the Concern child's suburban classroom peers. This created some problems since in most situations only one or two Project Concern children were in a class of approximately twenty students. Although the best estimate of peer growth could be obtained by testing all eighteen peers, this option was neither practically nor financially feasible. Upon

considering various alternatives, it was decided that an adequate estimate of suburban peer growth would be obtained by sampling at random four classroom peers from each classroom where a Project Concern child comprising the evaluation sample resided.

In the selection of the Hartford student evaluation sample, every effort was made to select students similar to those participating in the Project concern Program. The Hartford student evaluation sample is similar to the Project Concern evaluation sample to the extent that both groups were selected from similar eligible attendance areas (i.e., Title I Sending Schools) using the same modified random selection criteria used to select Project Concern participants.

A problem which can create some difficulty in the evaluation of a program such as Project Concern is sample attrition. Sample attrition is a situation where students who have been pretested are no longer available for post testing. Procedures were employed to ensure that differential sample attrition did not affect the outcomes of this follow-up study significantly.

Instrumentation and Treatment of the Data

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test is an individually administered evaluation instrument which yields scores in the following reading skill areas:

1. Letter Identification
2. Word Identification
3. Word Attack
4. Word Comprehension
5. Passage Comprehension
6. Total Reading

The Woodcock was administered on a pretest (Form B) and post test (Form A) basis to all students comprising the evaluation samples described by Hartford Test Specialists. For the most part, students were pretested in May 1976 and post tested in April 1977.

During the pre- and post testing, the Hartford Test Specialists recorded instances where students exhibited a level of distraction or anxiety which they thought cast doubt upon the accuracy of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results obtained. The occurrence of such testing problems was minimal across the three groups studied and ranged from an average of 2.7% at grade 3 to 1.3% at grade 7.

Pre- and post test Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results were collected for each student participating in this evaluation of Project Concern. The pre- and post test forms of a twenty-five percent random sample of students were drawn and checked for accuracy of scoring as well as the accuracy with which transformed scores were reported. Overall, the frequency of such errors was minimal. The Woodcock results were then keypunched and verified to insure their accuracy prior to computer analysis.

Findings

The major research question addressed in this follow-up study was:

> What Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth have Project Concern, Suburban Peer, and Hartford comparison students exhibited over the past year?

The pre- (May 1976) to post test (April 1977) growth data of the

three groups of students participating in this evaluation at grades 3, 5, and 7 are summarized in Tables 1-3. In reviewing these tables it is important to note that mastery scores have been used in this evaluation. Mastery scores report achievement and achievement gain in equal interval units. One can compare quantitatively the mastery score gain of students across subtests or across grade levels. For example, Hartford students at grade 5 exhibited the same level of gain (7 mastery score units) on the Letter Identification and Word Identification subtests (Table 3). Since mastery scores are equal interval units, all statistical analyses of the Woodcock results were conducted using mastery scores.

Returning our focus to Table 1, the statistical significance of the pre- to post test mastery score gains of Project Concern participants at each grade level were evaluated using correlated t-tests. From Table 1, it is evident that Concern students at each grade level exhibited statistically significant gains on each subtest of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, except at the grade 7 level. Perusal of the data in Table 1 indicates that significant gains were not made on the Letter Identification, Word Attack, and Word Comprehension subtests. It should be noted that students approached the maximum possible score on the pretest for the Letter Identification subtest. This "ceiling effect" explains the lack of increase in their post test performance.

The pre- to post test growth for the Suburban Peers on the Woodcock are presented in Table 2. Significant growth was found at each grade level for all subtests, except at grade 7 level. At this level significant gains were not found for the Letter Identification, Word Comprehension, and Word Attack subtests. Again, the "ceiling effect"

Table 1

Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery

Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the

Project Concern Sample

Test	Grade 3 N=64			Grade 5 N=66			Grade 7 N=70		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Letter Identification	139	158	19*	172	176	4*	177	178	1
Word Identification	133	153	20*	168	177	9*	186	191	5*
Word Attack	95	101	6*	108	111	3*	113	113	0
Word Comprehension	64	74	10*	82	84	2*	93	93	0
Passage Comprehension	78	87	9*	94	102	8*	108	111	3*
Total Reading	102	115	13*	125	130	5*	136	138	2*

*Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

Table 2

Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery

Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the

Suburban Classroom Peer Sample

Test	Grade 3 N=183			Grade 5 N=207			Grade 7 N=177		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Letter Identification	147	168	21*	176	179	3*	178	180	2
Word Identification	160	177	17*	188	195	7*	204	208	4*
Word Attack	109	117	8*	120	124	4*	126	127	2
Word Comprehension	81	86	5*	95	99	4*	108	109	1
Passage Comprehension	93	101	8*	109	115	6*	121	125	4*
Total Reading	118	130	12*	138	143	5*	148	150	2*

*Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

Table 3

Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery

Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the

Hartford Student Sample

Test	Grade 3 N=50			Grade 5 N=48			Grade 7 N=65		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Letter Identification	144	159	15*	169	176	7*	173	179	6*
Word Identification	130	152	22*	168	175	7*	187	195	8*
Word Attack	88	99	11*	109	111	2	119	119	0
Word Comprehension	60	72	12*	80	83	3*	88	91	3*
Passage Comprehension	75	86	11*	95	100	5*	106	11	5*
Total Reading	100	113	13	124	129	5	134	139	6*

*Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

on the pretest prohibited the students from gaining significantly on the Letter Identification post test.

Finally, the pre- to post test data for the Hartford comparison sample is presented in Table 3. With the exception of the Word Attack subtest at the grade 7 level, significant growth was found for all grade levels on the Woodcock subtests.

The growth of Project Concern participants was also analyzed using analysis of variance techniques to assess whether systematic differences in growth existed by grade, sex, or the number of years in the program. While greater amounts of growth were found at the lower grades than the higher grades ($p < .001$), no differences were detected between the growth of male and female participants at grades 3, 5, or 7. Also, analysis of growth by number of years in the program detected no significant differences.

Two additional research questions examined in this follow-up study were the following:

> Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of their Suburban classroom peers?
>
> Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from those students who have remained in Hartford?

To examine the first of these two questions, initial pretest differences between the groups were examined. At each grade level the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test subtest scores were compared for the Suburban Project Concern students and their Suburban classroom peers using t-tests. The Suburban peers were found to have significantly higher pretest scores than the Suburban Project Concern students on

all Woodcock subtests (except Letter Identification at grades 5 and 7) for all three grade levels ($p < .001$).

In order to accurately compare the growth of these two groups in light of such initial differences, multivariate analysis of covariance was employed. This procedure facilitates a comparison of the growth made on the vector of post test means of the two groups after "controlling" or "adjusting" for the initial differences between these groups.

The results of these analyses at each grade level indicate that the Suburban peers exhibited significantly greater growth than Suburban Project Concern students on all of the Woodcock subtests at the grade 3 level ($F = 3.41$, $df = 5,237$, $p < .005$). No differences were found at grades 5 and 7. Thus after adjusting the scores for initial pretest differences between the groups, relative growth in reading skills favors the Suburban peers at grade 3. But as the Project Concern students reach grades 5 and 7, there are no significant differences between the gains of Suburban Project Concern participants and Suburban classroom peers.

It should be noted that these findings do not indicate that the Suburban Project Concern and Suburban classroom peers have the same level of post test performance. In fact, the Suburban peers consistently have higher post test scores. The present analysis merely describes the differences in the amount of pre- to post test gain made by each group. It can be concluded that the level of gain in reading is more similar at grades 5 and 7 than at grade 3.

The final research question pertained to differences in growth between the Suburban Project Concern students and students remaining in Hartford. Multivariate analysis of covariance results at each grade level indicated that no significant differences were manifest in reading achievement growth when the Suburban Project Concern and Hartford

students were compared. Perusal of the standard score gains in Tables 1-3 suggests that this would be the case.

This section has provided an overview of the results of the follow-up study of the reading growth of Project Concern, Suburban peer and Hartford comparison students. In summary, the findings were as follows:

1. Project Concern students at grades 3 and 5 exhibited significant reading growth on all subtests of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. At the grade 7 level, significant growth was found on two of the five subtests.

2. Suburban classroom peers at grades 3 and 5 exhibited significant reading growth on all subtests of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. At the grade 7 level, significant growth was found on two of the five subtests.

3. Hartford students at grades 3 and 5 exhibited significant reading growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. At the grade 7 level, significant growth was found on most subtests.

4. Project Concern student growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test did not vary significantly by the number of years in the program. Greater growth was found at the lower grade levels.

5. Suburban classroom peers exhibited greater growth on all Woodcock Reading Mastery Test subtests than Project Concern students at the grade 3 level. No differences were found in reading growth between the two groups at grades 5 and 7.

6. No differences were found in student growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test between the Project Concern students and the Hartford comparison students.

In conclusion, one must be cautious in interpreting the reading growth results presented. One cannot generalize beyond this information to conclusions about overall reading ability or cognitive growth in other skill areas for the groups being compared.

An Assessment of the Effects of the In-City Component of Project Concern On Student Learning

A second phase of the 1976-1977 school year evaluation focused on the impact of the In-City component of Project Concern on student learning. The In-City Project Concern program is an effort where Hartford students from schools in less economically advantaged attendance areas (i.e., Title I schools) are bused to Hartford schools in more economically advantaged attendance areas.

The cognitive effects of the In-City Project Concern program were examined at grades 3, 5, and 7 using a pretest--post test design. Each spring students are tested in the Hartford Public Schools using the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT). Thus, the spring 1976 MAT results for students participating in the In-City Project Concern program were used as the pretest, while the spring 1977 MAT results were used as the post test. This pre- post test analysis of cognitive growth was conducted using the total group of In-City Project Concern participants at each of the grade levels studied (approximately 40 students per grade level).

Since students were selected for participation in the In-City Project Concern program using the same modified random selection criteria used for participation in the suburban component of the program, it was permissible to use the Hartford student sample described in the earlier phase of the 1976-1977 school year evaluation as a comparison group. Spring 1976 and spring 1977 MAT results were available for the

Hartford comparison group from the Hartford Public Schools Testing Office. Using these test results, it was possible to compare the cognitive growth of In-City program participants to a similar group of Hartford students not participating in the Project Concern program.

A final area of interest was the comparison of the cognitive growth of In-City project Concern participants to the cognitive growth of their classroom peers. A sample of the classroom peers of In-City Project Concern students was identified at grades 3, 5, and 7 by randomly selecting four peers from each classroom where an In-City program participant resided. Upon obtaining the spring 1976 and spring 1977 MAT results for these peer samples from the Hartford Public Schools Testing Office, the cognitive growth of In-City Project Concern participants was compared to the growth of a random sample of their classroom peers.

In summary, the effects of the In-City Project Concern program on student learning were assessed at grades 3, 5, and 7 in light of the following questions:

(1) What Metropolitan Achievement Test growth have In-City Project Concern students exhibited over the past year?

(2) Does the Metropolitan Achievement Test growth of In-City Project Concern students differ from the growth of Hartford comparison students not participating in the program?

(3) Does the Metropolitan Achievement Test growth of In-City Project Concern students differ from the growth of their classroom peers?

Upon collecting spring 1976 and spring 1977 MAT results for the groups being studied in the assessment of the cognitive effects of the

In-City component of the Project Concern Program, it was evident that pre- and post test comparisons could be conducted in the following areas for the grades indicated:

(1) Reading (Grades 3, 5, 7)

- (a) Word Knowledge
- (b) Reading
- (c) Total Reading

(2) Mathematics (Grades 5, 7)

- (a) Math Computation
- (b) Math Concepts
- (c) Math Problem Solving
- (d) Total Math

Pre- and post test Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) data for the In-City, Hartford comparison, and In-City peer samples were key-punched and verified prior to computer analysis. Research question 1, regarding the growth of the In-City Project Concern students was examined using related t-tests. Research questions 2 and 3 regarding comparisons of the In-City students' growth to the growth of the Hartford comparison and In-City classroom peer samples were examined using multivariate analysis of covariance. Multivariate analysis of covariance was employed to compare the respective vectors of post test scores using the pretest vectors as covariates. All statistical analyses were conducted using standard score MAT results due to the equal interval scale properties of standard scores.

Findings

To review, the first research question was as follows:

(1) What Metropolitan Achievement Test growth have In-City Project Concern students exhibited over the past Year?

Table 4 contains the pre- and post test data for the In-City sample for grades 3, 5, and 7. Perusal of the data indicates that significant growth in the pre- to post test means was exhibited on all subtests for the three grade levels studied except for Word Knowledge at the grade 5 level.

In addition, the pre- post test growth of the Hartford Comparison and In-City Peer samples was also assessed. Tables 5 and 6 contain the pre- and post test data for these samples at grades 3, 5, and 7. An examination of Tables 5 and 6 indicates that significant pre--post test growth was exhibited by both the Hartford Comparison and In-City Peer samples on all subtests of the MAT for the three grade levels studied.

The remaining two research questions were as follows:

(2) Does the Metropolitan Achievement Test growth of In-City Project Concern students differ from the growth of Hartford comparison students not participating in the program?

(3) Does the Metropolitan Achievement Test growth of In-City Project Concern students differ from the growth of their classroom peers?

Regarding the second research question, multivariate analysis of covariance comparing the In-City Project Concern reading growth to that of the Hartford comparison sample indicated that no significant differences were present between the two groups at grades 3 and 7. A difference was found at the grade 5 level. Greater gain was exhibited by the In-City Project Concern students than the Hartford comparison students at the grade 5 level in the reading area ($F = 3.72$, $df = 2.63$, $p < .05$). The MAT subtest contributing most to the difference was the Reading

Table 4

Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Pre and Post Test Mean

Reading and Math Results for In-City Project Concern Participants

Test	Grade 3 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 5 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 7 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N
Word Knowledge	54.3	60.0	5.7	3.26*	18	63.9	66.3	2.4	2.01	28	70.6	75.3	6.6	4.92*	36
Reading	52.6	59.1	6.6	3.95*	18	60.8	68.6	7.8	6.69*	18	74.2	77.4	3.3	2.22*	36
Total Reading	51.6	58.7	7.1	6.16*	18	60.8	66.6	5.8	5.88*	18	72.0	76.2	4.3	4.56*	36
Math Computation						68.1	76.0	7.9	5.73*	25	84.2	90.6	6.4	4.72*	35
Math Concepts						62.8	68.8	6.1	5.51*	25	74.5	84.4	9.9	8.27*	35
Math Problem Solving						61.3	68.8	7.5	5.02*	22	75.2	85.7	10.5	7.58*	35
Total Math						66.0	73.2	7.3	7.87*	25	81.6	91.8	10.2	10.26*	36

*Gain exhibited was significant at $p < .05$ level.

Table 5

Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Pre and Post Test Mean

Reading and Math Results for Hartford Comparison Participants

Test	Grade 3 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 5 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 7 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N
Word Knowledge	57.9	62.1	4.2	2.13*	37	65.6	69.7	4.1	3.46*	40	72.1	77.5	5.4	6.31*	38
Reading	52.9	59.7	6.8	6.43*	37	64.3	68.7	4.4	4.59*	40	72.9	79.6	6.7	5.12*	38
Total Reading	53.9	59.8	5.9	4.93*	37	64.3	68.7	4.5	4.37*	40	72.3	78.6	6.2	7.09*	38
Math Computation						70.4	78.5	8.1	4.93*	37	82.8	89.0	6.2	4.67*	37
Math Concepts						64.9	71.4	6.5	5.22*	37	76.6	81.4	4.8	2.91*	37
Math Problem Solving						64.3	75.0	10.7	4.35*	32	79.1	85.0	5.9	4.55*	34
Total Math						68.7	78.2	9.5	6.78*	35	84.8	90.4	5.6	4.37*	35

*Gain exhibited was significant at $p < .05$ level.

Table 6

Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Pre and Post Test

Reading and Math Results for In-City Peers

Test	Grade 3 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 5 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N	Grade 7 Pre	Post	Gain	t	N
Word Knowledge	59.1	63.5	4.4	2.86*	33	70.3	76.4	6.1	3.93*	37	80.9	87.5	6.6	6.77*	51
Reading	56.5	62.9	6.4	4.67*	33	69.4	78.8	9.4	6.24*	37	81.4	89.6	8.2	6.62*	51
Total Reading	56.9	62.9	6.0	4.53*	33	69.0	77.5	8.5	7.35*	37	81.6	89.3	7.7	8.37*	51
Math Computation						77.1	87.1	10.0	5.55*	33	91.0	98.4	7.4	5.62*	50
Math Concepts						72.3	79.0	6.7	4.44*	33	83.0	88.9	5.9	5.12*	50
Math Problem Solving						76.9	84.4	7.5	5.23*	31	86.9	95.0	8.1	8.01*	50
Total Math						76.5	83.9	7.4	5.60*	35	91.0	99.5	8.5	9.00*	50

*Gain exhibited was significant at $p < .05$ level.

subtest. No difference was found between the In-City Project Concern students and the Hartford comparison students in the math areas.

In comparing the reading growth of the In-City Project Concern students and their classroom peers, differences in reading growth were not found between the two groups at grades 3 and 5. At grade 7, In-City classroom peers exhibited greater reading growth level ($F = 6.31$, $df = 2.82$, $p < .05$). The MAT subtest contributing most to the difference was the Word Knowledge subtest.

In mathematics, grade 7 In-City classroom peers exhibited greater growth than the In-City Project Concern students, especially on the Math Problem Solving subtest ($F = 3.19$, $df = 3.79$, $p < .05$). No difference in math growth were found for grades 3 and 5.

An overview of the assessment of the impact of the In-City component of Project Concern on student learning has been provided in this section. In summary, the findings were as follows:

(1) Significant growth was exhibited in the reading and math areas for the In-City Project Concern students on most subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

(2) In-City Project Concern students exhibited greater gains at the grade 5 level than Hartford comparison students in the reading area as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. No differences were found at grades 3 and 7.

(3) No differences were found between the In-City Project Concern students and the Hartford comparison students in the math area as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

(4) In-City classroom peers exhibited greater growth than In-City Project Concern students in the reading area at the grade 7 level as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. No differences were found for the grade 3 and 5 levels.

(5) In-City classroom peers exhibited greater growth than In-City Project Concern students in the math area at the grade 7 level as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. No differences were found for grades 3 and 5.

Caution must be used in interpreting these findings. Although the groups examined were selected carefully, sample attrition was substantial at some grade levels since complete pre- and post test results were not available for some students. In many cases, these students were not administered the MAT during the spring of 1976 or 1977 since they were either absent from school or not enrolled in the Hartford Public Schools at the time of testing.

Monitoring the Basic Skill Performance of Suburban Project Concern Program Participants

In addition to the more thorough comparative assessments of the impact of Project concern on student learning conducted during the 1976-1977 school year, the basic skill performance of a 25% sample of suburban Project Concern participants at grades 1-8 was monitored during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school year evaluations. Student basic skill performance was assessed at alternate grade levels using the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests and the Keymath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test. These instruments were administered on a pre- and post test basis by Hartford Group Testers. Total Reading and Mathematics results for the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school years are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

In reviewing Tables 7 and 8, caution should be exercised

Table 7

Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mean Total Reading Performance for Suburban Project Concern Program Participants Expressed in Mastery and (Grade Equivalent) Scores

	1977-1978 School Year			
	Grade 1	Grade 3	Grade 5	Grade 7
Number Tested	34	31	34	34
Pretest	61	102	133	139
December 1, 1977	(1.4)	(2.6)	(4.8)	(5.8)
Post Test	79	104	135	141
June 1, 1978	(1.8)	(2.7)	(5.1)	(6.3)
Gain	18*	2	2*	2*
Over 6 Months	(.4)	(.1)	(.3)	(.5)

	1978-1979 School Year			
	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6	Grade 8
Number Tested	32	35	35	35
Pretest	102	127	138	142
January 1, 1979	(2.6)	(4.2)	(5.6)	(6.6)
Post Test	109	129	141	142
June 1, 1979	(3.0)	(4.4)	(6.3)	(6.6)
Gain	7*	2*	3*	0
Over 5 Months	(.4)	(.2)	(.7)	(.0)

*Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

Table 8

Summary of Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test Mean Total Mathematics Performance for Suburban Project Concern Program Participants Expressed in Raw and (Grade Equivalent) Scores

	1977-1978 School Year			
	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6	Grade 8
Number Tested	31	33	36	33
Pretested	73	117	141	169
December 1, 1977	(2.4)	(3.8)	(4.8)	(6.5)
Post Test	87	128	152	171
June 1, 1978	(2.8)	(4.2)	(5.4)	(6.7)
Gain	14*	11*	11*	2
Over 6 Months	(.4)	(.4)	(.6)	(.2)

	1978-1979 School Year			
	Grade 1	Grade 3	Grade 5	Grade 7
Number Tested	33	31	34	34
Pretest	59	103	136	162
January 1, 1979	(1.9)	(3.3)	(4.6)	(6.0)
Post Test	72	111	147	170
June 1, 1979	(2.4)	(3.6)	(5.2)	(6.6)
Gain	13*	8*	11*	8*
Over 5 Months	(.5)	(.3)	(.6)	(.6)

*Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

regarding the grade equivalent score results. These grade equivalent scores are presented since they are found by some to be desirable. The problem with grade equivalent scores is that they are not expressed in equal interval units. They cannot be used to compare gains on a particular quantitative test. For example, one cannot say that students at grades 2 and 4 have exhibited the same level of Total Mathematics gain (4 months) during the 1977-1978 school year. The numerical equivalence observed is an artifact of the grade equivalent score distribution and not a function of progress in the skill area being assessed. Grade equivalent scores can only be used to make qualitative comparisons of pretest status versus post test status for a particular group. One must be cautious to use grade equivalent scores only in this context. Quantitative numerical comparisons of gain must be made using mastery or possibly raw scores.

From Tables 7 and 8, it is evident that at most grade levels Suburban Project Concern participants exhibited statistically significant pre- to post test gains in Total Reading and Mathematics during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school years.

General Summary of the Impact of Project Concern on Student Learning

An overview of the more important findings of evaluation of the impact of Project Concern on Student Learning in the Basic Skill areas has been presented in this section. Two general trends emerge through a review of these findings. First, the results of these evaluations

indicate that Project Concern participants tend to exhibit statistically significant pre- to post test growth on measures of Basic Skill Reading and Math performance. Secondly, the more thorough evaluation of the impact of Project Concern conducted during the 1976-1977 school year indicated that the basic skill reading and math growth of Project Concern Suburban and In-City students tended to be similar to the basic skill growth of a similar group of students who remained in their Hartford Title I sending school environment.

II. IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON STUDENT ATTITUDES

Background

An initial inquiry into the attitudes of Project Concern participants was conducted as part of the 1975-1976 school year evaluation of Project Concern. A major finding of this evaluation was that Suburban Project Concern participants viewed their school experience more positively than their Hartford counterparts not participating in the Concern program. This finding was questioned. The basic question raised was whether this more positive view was a function of their suburban school experience or a function of leaving their less economically advantaged Hartford school environment. It was suggested that insights into this question could be gathered by comparing Suburban Project Concern students' views of their school experience to the views of In-City Project Concern participants. In-City Project Concern participants are Hartford students from schools in less economically advantaged areas. Since In-City Project Concern participants have left their less economically advantaged school environments for the more economically advantaged school environments in other areas of Hartford, the comparison of In-City and Suburban Project Concern students' views of their school experience would provide some insights into the effect of leaving the less economically advantaged school environment versus the effect of the suburban school experience on the attitudes of Project Concern students toward school. In addition, it has been suggested that further insights into the affective disposition of In-City Project Concern participants could be derived if information was collected regarding the affective

disposition of the classroom peers of In-City participants.

The Design of This Assessment

Given the considerations identified, in the 1976-1977 School Year Evaluation of Project Concern examined the affective impact of Project Concern at grades 3, 5, and 7 by comparing the views of the following groups toward their school experience.

(1) In-City Project Concern participants

(2) Suburban Project Concern participants

(3) In-City classroom peers

(4) Hartford comparison students from schools in less economically advantaged attendance areas.

More specific information regarding these groups as well as the sampling procedures used to identify each group was provided in Section I of this report. The number of students who participated in this affective assessment is summarized by group and grade level in Table 9.

In examining the affective impact of Project Concern, the following questions were addressed:

(1) How do In-City Project Concern participants, Suburban Project Concern participants, In-City classroom peers, and Hartford comparison students from schools in less economically advantaged attendance areas view their school experience.

(2) Do In-City Project Concern participants view their school experience differently than Hartford comparison students from schools in less economically advantaged attendance areas.

(3) Do In-City Project Concern participants view their school experience differently than their classroom peers?

(4) Do In-City Project Concern participants view their school experience differently than Suburban Project Concern participants?

Table 9

Summary by Group and Grade Level of the Number of Students who Participated in the Assessment of the Affective Impact of Project Concern

Group	Grade 3	5	7	Total
In-City Project Concern	37	36	39	112
Suburban Project Concern	64	66	70	200
In-City Classroom Peers	46	50	57	153
Hartford Comparison Students	50	48	65	163

Instrumentation

Each group's view of its school experience was assessed using the structured interview forms developed for the 1975-1976 Evaluation of Project Concern. These student interviews were conducted by Hartford Test Specialists during April, 1977.

It is important to note that considerable thought was devoted to methods for assessing the affective impact of Project Concern during the 1975-1976 evaluation effort. Communities participating in the evaluation of Project Concern felt quite strongly that the general structured interview format developed for the assessment of the affective impact of the program was far superior to the student self-concept or attitude toward school questionnaire format. Serious doubt was cast upon the validity or accuracy of available student questionnaires or surveys for the assessment of the affective impact of Project Concern. The basic argument presented was that such techniques were inherently

culturally biased and would not provide quality information for policy decision-making.

Analysis of the Interview Results

Responses to the items comprising the structured interview form were coded and keypunched to facilitate computer analysis of the information obtained. In addition, typescripts were prepared by group and grade level for those items where the student was asked to explain or clarify the response provided. Chi-square analysis techniques were used to determine if differences existed among the responses of the groups studied in light of the research questions posed.

Findings

General Views of In-City Concern, Hartford Comparison, In-City Peer, and Suburban Concern Students Toward Their School Experience

Seven of the items contained in the pupil interview forms were common across the four groups studied. For the most part, these items focused on students' general perceptions of school life along various dimensions. The first common item focused on how students liked going to their school. The majority (67%) of the students in the four groups surveyed liked going to their school at least "most of the time" Further analysis of responses to this item showed no significant grade level or sex differences in the student responses with the exception of the Hartford comparison group. For the Hartford comparison group, third grade students liked going to their school most, while seventh grade students liked going to their school least.

Another area assessed by two common items on the pupil survey was students' perceptions of the amount of cooperation which took place in the classroom. One item focused on students' views of the degree of cooperation, while the other item focused on the individual student's involvement in the process. The majority of students (82%) in the four groups assessed perceived children in their class as helping each other with their classwork at least some of the time. Also, most students (72%) felt their classmates helped them with their classwork at least some of the time. Two significant grade level trends emerged in this assessment of students' perceptions of the amount of cooperation which took place in the classroom. For In-City classroom peers, fifth graders perceived children in their classroom helping each other more often than did In-City peers at grades three or seven. For Hartford comparison students, fifth graders perceived themselves as receiving help from their classmates more often than did Hartford comparison students at grades three or seven.

The final two common items on the student survey focused on assessing how friendly student relationships were in the classroom. The majority of students surveyed felt the children in their class were friendly to them as well as to each other most of the time. Some interesting significant sex and grade level trends emerged for these items. For the Hartford comparison group, fifth grade students perceived relationships in their classroom as measured by these two items to be less friendly than did the third and seventh grade pupils comprising the Hartford comparison group. Also, male Suburban Project Concern participants view their classmates as being more friendly toward them than did

female Suburban Concern participants.

In addition to the structured questions, the four student groups interviewed were asked the following two open-ended questions:

(1) What do you like best about going to your school?

(2) What do you like least about going to your school?

For the most part, the student responses to these items did not provide discriminating information about the different groups being studied. Students in the four groups examined tended to provide brief answers focusing on particular school subjects, school activities, physical building conditions, peer relations, or school rules and regulations.

In-City Peers' Views of In-City Concern Participants

The student interview form developed for use with In-City peers contained three items designed to elicit this group's perceptions of In-City Project Concern participants. About 85% of the In-City peers knew that there were In-City Project Concern participants in their classroom. Furthermore, the majority of the In-City peers (72%) felt they were friendly toward the In-City Concern participants and the In-City Concern participants were friendly to them at least most of the time. This positive view of the relationship between In-City peers and In-City Concern participants did not vary by student sex or grade level.

Hartford Comparison Student Views of the Project Concern Program

One item unique to the student interview form developed for use with Hartford comparison students asked these students whether they would want to go to school in one of the towns outside of Hartford, if they had

the chance. About 55% of the students felt they would like to attend school in the suburbs, while about 33% would not. The remaining students (12%) were undecided. An analysis of these student responses indicated that female students were more predisposed to attending school outside of Hartford than male students. When asked why they wanted to attend school in the suburbs, Hartford comparison students provided responses such as the following:

"I think my mother would like it,"

"You learn more there,"

"See how other schools are,"

"Meet new people."

Comparison of In-City Project Concern Participant Views of Their School Experience to the Views of the Other Groups Studied

To this point, the discussion of the results of student interviews conducted has responded to the initial research question posed. The remaining three questions which served as the basis for this investigation of student attitudes focused on whether In-City Project Concern participants viewed their school experience differently than (1) Hartford comparison students, (2) In-City classroom peers, or (3) Suburban Project Concern participants. The results of chi-square analyses comparing the responses of In-City Concern participants to the other three groups studied for the seven common items addressed by the student interview forms yielded the following findings:

(1) There was no significant difference between the responses of In-City Concern participants and the responses of Hartford comparison students with the exception of one item. Hartford comparison students

viewed themselves as working harder at their school work than In-City Concern participants.

(2) There was no significant difference between the responses of In-City Concern participants and the responses of In-City peers with the exception of one item. In-City Concern participants the children in their class as being somewhat more friendly to them than do In-City peers.

(3) There was no significant difference between the responses of In-City Concern participants and the responses of Suburban Concern Participants.

In-City Versus Suburban Participants' Views of Project Concern

The In-City Project Concern and Suburban Project Concern student interview forms contained eight common items. In terms of their background, In-City and Suburban participants were quite similar in that approximately 95% of both groups had brothers or sisters in school. While the siblings of Suburban Concern participants were quite evenly distributed between attendance at schools in the suburbs and Hartford, most (73%) siblings of In-City Concern students attended school in Hartford.

Over 90% of the In-City and Suburban Concern participants perceived their brothers or sisters as either liking the idea or not caring that they were attending school outside of their neighborhood. When questioned as to whether it would be good for their siblings to go to their school, Suburban Concern students exhibited a significantly greater preference to have their brothers or sisters attend their school than did In-City participants. When questioned as to why they wanted their siblings to attend their school, Suburban Concern students provided responses such as the following:

"Learn more things,"

"They want to, they keep asking."

Most (86%) Suburban Project Concern students perceived their friends in Hartford as either liking or not caring about their attending a school outside of their neighborhood. In-City participants' views differed significantly in this area in that a larger portion of In-City Concern students felt their friends did not like them attending a school outside of their neighborhood. In terms of continuation in Project Concern, Suburban Project Concern participants exhibited a significantly stronger preference for continuing at their school in the future than did In-City participants. Furthermore, Suburban Project Concern students perceived their parents as being significantly more supportive of their continuation at that school than did In-City Concern participants. When asked why they wanted to continue at their school next year, both In-City and Suburban Concern students cited reasons such as the following:

"I like the kids who go there, I like the teachers,"

"Learn more there,"

"More fun,"

"My mother says it's better."

A Cautionary Note on the Use of Student Survey Results

In reviewing these results, it is important to be careful in interpreting the term, "Hartford Students." These are the students comprising the Hartford evaluation sample drawn for this study only. They are students similar to those participating in Project Concern in that

they meet the eligibility criteria for potential participation in Project Concern. No generalization can be made from the Hartford student responses provided in this section to the views of the general population of students attending the Hartford Public Schools.

Also, it is important to note that these student survey results must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the survey, the wording of the questions used, and the knowledge and experiences of the students surveyed.

To this point the discussion of students' attitudes toward Project Concern has not addressed how classroom peers in the Suburban schools view the Suburban Project Concern participants or how the attitudes toward schools of Suburban Project Concern participants compare to those of their classroom peers. These issues were addressed during the 1975-1976 school year evaluation of Project Concern.

Information concerning these views was collected using a structured interview form developed for the 1975-1976 Evaluation of Project Concern. Interviews were conducted with Suburban Project Concern participants and their classroom peers at grades 2, 4, and 6 by Hartford Test Specialists during May, 1976.

Suburban Peers Views of Concern Participants

Analyses of the interview responses indicated that about 90% of the Suburban peers knew that there were Hartford children in their class. The majority of Suburban peers felt they were friendly toward the Hartford children (72%) and the Hartford children were friendly toward them (65%) at least most of the time. This positive view of the relationship

between Suburban peers and Concern participants held by Suburban students increased slightly, but not significantly, by grade level. Sixth grade Suburban students perceived their relationship with Concern participants to be slightly more friendly than second grade Suburban students.

Suburban Project Concern Participants' and Classroom Peers' Attitudes Toward School

In comparing Concern participants' and classroom peers views across a series of common items, some interesting findings emerged. Concern students at grades 4 and 6 perceived their school experience in a significantly more positive light than their Suburban classroom peers at the same grade levels.

Two interview items focused on the difficulty and quality of the students' classwork. A significant trend emerged in this area for Concern pupils. At grade 2 the majority (58%) of Concern Pupils perceive themselves as working harder than others in their class, but this focus decreases by grade level to the point that the majority (60%) of Concern participants at grade 6 see themselves as working at about the same level as other students in their class. Looking at this trend from another perspective, grade 2 Concern students view themselves as working harder than their Suburban peers, but by grade 6 both groups perceive themselves as working at the same level.

Turning to students' perceptions of the quality of their classwork, Concern and Suburban peer students exhibited an interesting significant trend in that the dominant response for Concern second grade students was that their work was better than the work of their classroom peers.

But by the sixth grade this focus decreased to the point that the majority of sixth grade Concern and Suburban students viewed their work as being of the same quality as their classroom peers.

Another area assessed by two common items in the pupil interview was students' perceptions of the amount of cooperation which took place in the classroom. One item focused on students' view of the degree of cooperation, while the other item focused on the individual students' involvement in the process. The majority of Concern and Suburban peer students at grades 2, 4, and 6 perceived children in their class as helping each other with their classwork at least some of the time. Also, most students felt their classmates helped them with their schoolwork at least some of the time. An interesting significant finding at grades 4 and 6 was that Concern pupils perceived themselves as receiving more help from their classmates than Suburban students.

The final two common items on the student interview focused on assessing how friendly student relationships were in the classroom. The majority of students surveyed felt the children in their class were friendly to them as well as to each other most of the time. An interesting significant trend emerged in that Concern students at grades 2, 4, and 6 perceived their classmates as being more friendly to them than did their Suburban peers.

Monitoring the Attitudes of Project Concern Participants

In addition to the more comprehensive assessments of student attitudes toward Project Concern conducted during the 1975-1976 and

1976-1977 school years, the attitudes of Concern participants were monitored during the 1977-1978, 1978-1979, and 1979-1980 school year evaluations. Attitudes were monitored in the areas of self-concept and attitude toward school using a brief ten item Student Survey administered during the spring of the school year. The 10 items contained in this Student Survey were selected from the Instructional Objectives Exchange nationally normed item pool to assess the areas of self-concept and attitude toward school.

Given the close relationship between how students feel about themselves (self-concept) and their attitudes toward various school situations, the set of 10 items was selected to generally reflect both constructs. Responses of Concern participants to the Student Survey for the 1977-1978, 1978-1979, and 1979-1980 school years are summarized in Table 10.

In reviewing Table 10, it is clear from responses to items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8, that most students feel quite comfortable with their school work. Also, responses to items 2, 4, 9, and 10 indicate the majority of Concern participants are received well and feel comfortable in their classroom settings. In summary, it can be concluded that the self-concept and school attitudes of Project Concern students in the areas of school and school work, classroom participation and teachers are quite positive.

Table 10

Summary By School Year Of the Percent and Frequency Of "True" Responses On the Student Survey For Project Concern Participants

Items Comprising The Student Survey	1977-1978[1] (N=197)	1978-1979[1] (N=200)	1979-1980[2] (N=882)
1. School work is fairly easy for me.	60% (119)	62% (123)	63% (559)
2. My teachers usually like me.	94% (185)	91% (182)	87% (767)
3. I can get good grades if I want to.	84% (165)	83% (165)	83% (736)
4. I often volunteer to do things in class.	70% (138)	72% (144)	72% (633)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	45% (88)	45% (89)	44% (385)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	34% (66)	28% (55)	29% (252)
7. I am proud of my school work.	85% (167)	82% (163)	85% (746)
8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	52% (102)	51% (101)	45% (389)
9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	46% (91)	45% (89)	46% (402)
10. I don't like to be called on in class.	30% (59)	22% (43)	26% (231)

[1]Based on the responses of a 25% sample of Suburban Project Concern participants at grades 3-8.

[2]Based on the responses of participants in all components of the Project Concern Program at grades 2-8.

General Summary of the Impact of Project Concern on Student Attitudes

The evaluations of the impact of Project Concern on student attitudes which have been summarized in this section support the following major findings.

(1) Project Concern students tended to exhibit a positive attitude toward their school experience, their school work, and their classroom peers.

(2) Suburban Project Concern students were received well by their Suburban classroom peers.

(3) In-City Project Concern students were received well by their In-City classroom peers.

(4) Participation in Project Concern tended not to have a major negative effect on Project Concern students' relationships with their neighborhood friends.

(5) In-City and Suburban Concern participants tended not to differ significantly in their attitudes toward their Project Concern school experience, their school work, and their classroom peers.

(6) In-City Concern participants and Hartford comparison students tended not to differ significantly in their attitudes toward their school experience, their school work, and their classroom peers.

III. CAREER PATTERNS OF PROJECT CONCERN GRADUATES

Background

The 1976-1977 evaluation examined the career patterns of Project Concern graduates from the 1974, 1975, and 1976 classes. The level of career aspiration, work history, and college training were examined for the consistency of career planning and career progression. For the 25 graduates studied, a relatively high level of occupational and educational success was found. While these findings were quite positive, they were limited as they represented graduates who "made it" and were probably the best adjusted and most able students.

Research Design and Data Analysis

To further the evaluation of the effects of Project Concern in the area of career development, a more comprehensive study was carried out which replicated the 1976-1977 Project Concern graduate findings and included two comparison groups, Project Concern dropouts and Hartford students.

The 1977, 1978, and 1979 Project Concern graduates totaled 105 students. Fifteen students from each year were randomly selected for the follow-up study, yielding a sample of 45 students. The second group, Project Concern dropouts, consisted of 15 students who met the following criteria:

(1) Participated at least 2 years in Project Concern.

(2) Dropped out of the project in either 6, 7, or 8th grade.

(3) Returned to and graduated from the Hartford school system.

Initially, 47 students were identified from the potential 1977-1979 graduating classes who left the project. Of these 47, only 15 met all of the criteria listed above.

The third group, Hartford non-participants, consisted of 10 students randomly selected from each of the 1977-1979 Hartford graduating classes. This sample of 30 students met the following criteria:

(1) Attended Hartford elementary and secondary schools.

(2) Attended Title I eligible schools.

(3) Were eligible to be selected for Project Concern (i.e., not in special education).

For each of these groups studied, information was gathered regarding each student's occupational and educational plans as well as work history using a Follow-up of Graduates Survey. Project Concern staff collected this information for Project Concern graduates. Forms were mailed to each of the 45 students selected. Follow-up phone calls and mailings were conducted to enhance the return rate. Forms for the drop-out and non-participant groups were mailed through the Hartford Public Schools, Office of Research and Evaluation. Prior to this mailing, the last known address of each student was verified by phone. After the initial mailing, follow-up procedures consisted of phone calls, a second mailing, and in a few cases, a home visit. The validity of this career pattern study was dependent upon achieving respectable return rates. Due to the dedication and organizational ability of the Project Concern and Hartford Public Schools Research Office Staff, the return rates for this study were quite high.

Data analysis consisted of developing frequencies and percentages

for each item on the Follow-up of Graduates Survey. Responses to some items were coded for level of career aspiration and consistency prior to calculating the percentages. Comparisons were then made among the three target groups. Responses to open-ended questions were recorded on typescripts for interpretation. Where appropriate, chi-square analyses were conducted.

Level of career aspiration was determined using the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Rating Scale. This rating is based on a national opinion survey of the relative prestige of various occupations. Generally, higher levels of prestige are ascribed to the occupations which require high levels of education or training and provide a greater financial return. The validity of this rating system has been demonstrated in a number of research studies from 1949 to the present. The occupational prestige rating groups are divided into ten categories. For the purposes of this study, each career/occupational choice identified by the respondent was assigned a numerical value from one (high to ten (low) based on its' location on the scale.

The consistency of career patterns for graduates in the three groups was examined using information about each respondent's job/career choice, work history, and post-high school educational activities. The career pattern for each respondent was categorized into one of three groups: consistent, inconsistent, or mixed. A consistent career pattern was one in which the occupational choice was reinforced by a work history and/or post-secondary educational activity which would tend to lead to the attainment of that occupation.

Findings

Several statistically significant differences were found which consistently favored the Project Concern graduates. These statistically significant findings are presented below as Primary Conclusions. The second section, entitled Secondary Conclusions, contains "trends" which generally favored the graduates but did not reach statistical significance.

Primary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following primary conclusions are forwarded:

(1) Occupational choices made in high school were at a significantly higher occupational level for Project Concern graduates than those for the non-participants.

(2) Project Concern graduates (67%) and dropouts (80%) were judged to have significantly more consistent career patterns when compared to non-participants (37%).

(3) A significantly larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (72%) was involved in post-high school education and/or vocational training than project dropouts (39%).

Secondary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following secondary conclusions or "trends" are forwarded:

(1) Project Concern graduates required less time (3.4 months) in finding full-time employment after high school graduation than dropouts (3.9 months) or non-participants (7.2 months).

(2) A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (90%) made vocational choices in high school than dropouts (69%) or non-participants (79%).

(3) Project Concern graduates and dropouts would appear to be more realistic in their future career choices (5 years from now) than non-participants.

(4) Project Concern graduates (64%) were more likely to have held a full-time job when compared to dropouts (56%) and non-participants (58%).

(5) Project Concern graduates were more likely (68%) to be employed in or taking training for the career they wanted while they were in high school than either dropouts (58%) or non-participants (56%).

(6) A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (77%) reported that they liked their jobs than did dropouts (54%) or non-participants (58%).

(7) A larger percentage of graduates "liked" their present job when compared to dropouts or non-participants.

(8) Project Concern graduates tend to report more difficulties with their present job than non-participants.

(9) Project Concern graduates are less likely to feel that their high school education helped them get the job they wanted when compared to non-participants.

In summary, the data presented here provide clear, strong support for the contention that Project Concern has had a positive effect on the career development and maturity of the students who participated in the program. Project Concern graduates exhibited significantly higher levels of aspiration and significantly more consistent career planning and progression than non-participants. While not statistically significant, graduates were also more likely to seek post-secondary education or vocational training when compared to non-participants. Although not as consistent as program graduates, those students who dropped out of Project Concern prior to graduation tended to show a number of positive benefits as well. Measured against those who did not participate in Project Concern, graduates and dropouts alike appear to have received significant career development benefits.

IV. FACTORS ACCOUNTING FOR STUDENT ATTRITION FROM PROJECT CONCERN

Background

During each school year approximately eight percent of the Project Concern students leave the program. During the 1976-1977 evaluation, a management and record keeping system was developed for monitoring the "who," "where," and "why" for 117 (8.4%) students who left the project. This information is important if project staff are to meet the needs of all participants in the hope of reducing future student attrition. During the 1979-1980 year, the record system was again employed for the purpose of replicating the 1976-1977 attrition study. In particular, the areas of transfers to Hartford Public Schools and "No Shows" were targeted for comprehensive follow-up.

Design and Implementation of the 1979-1980 Attrition Study

The record system used to monitor student attrition was the same one used in the 1976-1977 evaluation. Areas covered included: change of address, transfer to another school, no shows, pregnancy, correctional institutions, and other reasons.

The attrition data were gathered by project staff for 112 students who left the project between September 1979, and June 1980. Data analysis consisted of descriptive frequencies and percentages for each category in the attrition form. Open-ended comments were summarized for later analyses.

Results of the Attrition Study

During the September 1979 to June 1980 period, 112 of 1,373 or 8.2% of the students left the project. This figure can be compared to an attrition rate of 8.4% (117/1,386) during the 1976-1977 year. Table 11 contains a breakdown of the attrition figures by category and grade level. Perusal of the table indicates that Transfers to Another School and Change of Address were the main reasons for attrition. These figures are similar to those obtained in 1976-1977, except for the "No Show" area which was reduced from 22% to 5%.

A "No Show" is a student who enrolls in the program during the summer but does not enter the program in September. The primary reason for the reduction in "No Shows" is the expanded emphasis placed upon comprehensive parental orientation during the summer (e.g., bus schedules). Parents of prospective Project Concern students were contacted by phone and told about all aspects of the program. A bilingual staff member called all Hispanic parents. These calls were then followed by a letter further describing the child's participation in the project. A secondary reason for the reduction was the comprehensive screening of each student's history for special education situations prior to entrance into the program.

Of the 53% of the students (59) who transferred to another school, most (55 students) returned to the Hartford Public Schools. Two students each transferred to a private school and a technical school. The specific reasons for the 55 students returning to Hartford Public Schools were further examined. Table 11 indicates that these transfers took place at all grade levels with the highest frequencies found at grades 10, 9,

Table 11

Frequency of Students Leaving Project Concern

by Reason and Grade Level

1979-1980

Grade Level	Reason/Frequency: Change of Address	Transfer to Another School[a]	No Show	Pregnancy	Correctional Institution	Other	Total
Elementary: 45%							
1	1	4	3				8
2	2	2					4
3	4	1	1				6
4	7	2	1				10
5	7	6					13
6	7	2	1				10
Middle: 19%							
7	4	7					11
8	7	3					10
Secondary: 36%							
9	5	13[a]		1			19
10		14		1			15
11		3					3
12		2				1	3
TOTAL	44	59	6	2	0	1	112
PERCENTAGE	39%	53%	5%	2%		1%	

[a]All Transfers to Another School were to Hartford Public Schools except two private and two technical school transfers at grade 9.

and 7. Table 12 presents a breakdown of the reasons for the transfers. The primary reasons for returning to the Hartford Public Schools appear to be Social, Disciplinary, and Special Education. All of the reasons listed in Table 12 will be discussed in the order they are presented in the table. Note that the 65 cases referred to in the table represent 55 students; 10 students were associated with two reasons each.

Special Education recommendations accounted for 13 students. These students were identified by the Suburban schools as possibly needing some form of full-time special support program.

Special Academic Program recommendations were made for five students. These programs were not available in the Suburban school. In most cases the programs consisted of more extensive individual academic instruction.

Disciplinary and Social reasons were listed for 14 and 16 students respectively. In several cases the disciplinary and social reasons were found to be related and consisted of non-compliance with school regulations. In some cases students desired to return to Hartford to be closer to their friends for social reasons which included athletic activities. Note that the percentage of students returning to the Hartford schools for disciplinary and social reasons has increased from 33% in 1976-1977 to approximately 50% during the 1979-1980 school year. The approximate figure of 50% is used since two students represented both disciplinary and social categories. Part of this "increase" is created by the overall decrease in the number of "No Shows" during the 1979-1980 year.

Part-Time Employment and Home Need were not listed for any students returning to Hartford.

Table 12

Reasons for 55 Student Transfers to the Hartford Public Schools and Associated Student Frequencies

1979-1980

Reason	Frequency
Recommended for Special Education	13
Recommended for Special Academic Program	5
Disciplinary	14
Social	16
Part-Time Employment	—
Medical	2
Parent Home Need	—
Other	15
TOTAL	65[a]

[a]Note that the 65 cases represent 55 students as 10 students were associated with two reasons each.

Medical reasons were listed for two students returning to Hartford. One student enrolled in a drug rehabilitation program and the other in a residential psychiatric program.

The "Other" category was applicable for 15 students. The primary reason listed was excessive absences. Following this, reasons listed for individual students were such areas as failing to complete academic requirements, parental request, and transportation problems.

In summary, studies of student attrition from Project Concern have yielded the following findings:

(1) Student attrition tends to be approximately 8%.

(2) Student attrition has been highest between grades 4 and 10.

(3) Main reasons for attrition have been change of address and transfer to another school.

(4) Most students transferring to another school returned to the Hartford Public Schools for disciplinary and social reasons as well as for full-time special education services which could not be provided in the Suburban schools.

(5) Efforts of Project Concern staff have been successful in significantly reducing attrition due to "No Shows".

V. HARTFORD PARENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PROJECT CONCERN

Background

As noted earlier, the 1976-1977 School Year Evaluation of Project Concern focused on a comprehensive assessment of the impact of Project Concern on Student Learning at grades 3, 5, and 7. Three randomly selected groups were examined as follows: Suburban Project Concern, In-City Project Concern, and Hartford comparison students. Hartford comparison students were similar to Project Concern participants in that they were selected from Project Concern "Sending Schools" using the modified random sampling procedures used to identify project participants. The 1976-1977 school year evaluation also included a survey of a sample the parents of these Hartford students to obtain their views of the Project Concern program. A sample of non-public school Concern parents was also included in this survey. In summary this survey focused on the following Hartford parents:

(1) Parents of Suburban Project Concern Students.

(2) Parents of Non-Public Project Concern Students.

(3) Parents of In-City Project Concern Students.

(4) Parents of Project Concern "Sending School" Students Not Participating in the Program.

Design of the Parent Survey

Employing student name lists for these groups, 381 parents were randomly selected to be interviewed. Also, a list of parent alternates

was prepared in cases where a selected parent could not be interviewed. For the Participating Project Concern Parents, names and addresses were obtained from the Project Concern office. For Non-Participating Parents, this information was obtained from school records at the respective school attended by the student.

Table 13 contains the number of parent interviews conducted at the three grade levels studied.

Table 13

Number of Parent Interviews Conducted

by Parent Group and Student Grade Level

Parent Group	Grade 3	5	7	Total
Suburban	45	45	45	135
Non-Public	15	13	10	38
In-City	19	20	20	59
Non-Participating	50	48	50	148
TOTAL				380

The parent interview forms used in this study were developed cooperatively through an extensive series of meetings with the Hartford Public Schools personnel and Project Concern Parent Advisory Council members. A crucial factor in conducting the parent interviews was the selection of qualified interviewers. Six interviewers were selected on the basis of knowledge of the neighborhoods where the interviews

would be conducted, language ability (Spanish and English), and interviewing skills. The interviewers consisted of four females and two males; three were bilingual (Spanish-English) and three were Black. Training was done on an individual basis, with special care given to interviewing techniques, items on the survey, and the overall evaluation design.

Before interviews were conducted, all parents were contacted to set a time and place for the interview. While the majority of interviews took place at the parent's home, a few parents requested to be interviewed at their place of business. Also, fifteen were interviewed over the telephone. Telephone interviews occurred at the request of the parent when they were called to arrange an appointment after an unsuccessful home contact. Others were called because they had moved and a new address was not available. Note that telephone interviews were made only at the request of the parent. To insure the accuracy of the parent interview information obtained, ten percent of the parents were contacted a second time to confirm that the interview was conducted according to the procedures planned. No discrepancies were found.

In analyzing the responses to the survey for Hartford parents with students participating in Project Concern, response frequencies, percentages, and chi-square statistics were generated for each item to examine whether significant relationships were evident between parent attitudes and the following variables:

(1) Parent group (Suburban, Non-Public, In-City)

(2) Grade of student

(3) Sex of student

(4) Parents who felt informed about the program versus parents who felt they were not informed.

(5) Parents who had one child in the program versus parents who had several children in the program.

Chi-square analyses indicated that statistically significant relationships were not evident between parent attitudes and these variables.

The survey of Hartford parents with children in Project Concern resulted in a large volume of information. Some of the more significant findings are the following:

(1) Most parents (84% felt well informed about Project Concern. The Suburban group had the highest percentage of parents who felt well informed (85%).

(2) Most parents (92%) liked the placement of their child in the respective Project Concern school. The Non-Public (95%) and Suburban (94%) parents seemed more pleased with their child's placement than the In-City (85%) parents. Parents of third grade children seemed the most pleased with their child's school placement (96%). When asked why they felt this way, parents suggested that their child was "learning more" in the Project Concern school.

(3) Most parents (90%) indicated that their child liked going to the Project Concern school. The highest percentage of "Like" responses was found for the Suburban group (93%), especially at grades 3 (96%) and 7 (96%). At grade 5 the group with the highest percentage of parents indicating their child liked going to the Project Concern school was the In-City group (95%).

When asked why their child felt this way, parents suggested that their child enjoyed the students, teachers, and environment at the Project Concern school.

(4) Nearly all (99%) of the parents indicated that their child is friends with students at the Project

Concern school. Note that all (100%) of the Suburban and Non-Public group parents indicated that this was the case.

(5) Approximately half (53%) of the parents indicated that children from the Project Concern school had visited their home. The highest percentage of visitations took place for the In-City (56%) and Suburban (55%) groups and at the fifth (64%) and seventh (56%) grade levels.

When asked to comment on the reason for the visits, Non-Public and Suburban parents suggested such activities as overnight and weekend stays, playing together, and parties. The In-City parents suggested such activities as general visits, parties, and playing sports.

(6) The majority of parents (67%) stated that their child had visited the home of a child in the Project Concern school. No differences were found in the parent responses across the three project components. Most visits took place at the fifth (74%) and seventh (71%) grade levels. At grades three and five the highest percentages were found for the Non-Public component (60% and 77%); at the seventh grade level the highest percentage was found for the Suburban group (73%).

When asked why their child had made such a visit, the Suburban and Non-Public parents suggested such reasons as parties, overnights, and weekends; the In-City parents indicated general visits.

(7) Most parents (93%) indicated that their child is still friendly with children in the local neighborhood since participating in Project Concern. The highest percentages of parent affirmative responses were found for the Non-Public (95%) and Suburban (93%) groups, as well as the third grade level (96%).

(8) Several parents (34%) indicated that their child had transportation problems (1976-1977) going to and from the Project Concern school. The group with the highest percentage of parents indicating that problems existed was in the In-City group (46%); the lowest percentage was manifest for the Non-Public group (26%). A greater percentage of parents with children in the fifth (40%) and seventh (36%) grades felt there were transportation problems than did parents of third graders (28%). For the In-City group the highest percentage of parents noting problems existed were

the seventh grade parents (56%); the Suburban and Non-Public parents had children in the fifth (41%) and seventh (40%) grades.

When asked what the problems were and how often they occurred, several In-City parents noted that buses left both early and late, and that a lack of supervision and heat were often a problem on the bus. Several Suburban and Non-Public parents mentioned late arrivals, lack of heat, and a lack of supervision by the aides on the buses.

(9) Most parents (93%) indicated that they would like to see Project Concern continue in the future. The highest degree of support came from the parents in the Suburban (95%) and Non-Public (95%) components, followed by the In-City component parents (88%). The highest support was also found at the third grade level (96%), especially for the Non-Public (100%) and Suburban (98%) components.

When asked why they favored continuing the program, parents from all three groups emphasized the better quality education (some parents noted better curriculum, smaller classes, and more teacher contact) and the benefits of integration with other children.

(10) Several parents (40%) indicated that there were things they would like to change about the Project Concern program. Parents in the In-City component (44%) and parents with children at the fifth grade level (47%) indicated the greatest desire to make changes in the program. The highest percentages of parents calling for program changes for the program components within grade levels were the In-City parents at the seventh grade level (55%), Non-Public parents at the third grade level (53%), and Suburban parents at the fifth grade level (46%).

When asked what things they would like to change, parents from all three groups emphasized better bus schedules, supervision by the aides, and heat on the buses.

Views of Parents of Non-Participating Students

In analyzing the responses to the survey for Hartford parents without students participating in Project Concern, response frequencies,

percentages, and chi-square statistics were generated for each item to examine whether significant relationships were evident between parent attitudes and the following variables:

(1) Grade of student (3, 5, or 7)

(2) Sex of student

Chi-square analyses indicated that generally significant relationships were not evident between parent attitudes and these variables.

The survey of Hartford parents without children in Project Concern resulted in a large volume of information. Some of the more significant findings are the following.

(1) The majority of parents (62%) knew about Project Concern. Of these parents, most felt the program was a good program and provided children a better education and exposure to other children.

(2) Some parents (32%) indicated that their child was friends with children in Project Concern; many were not sure if this was the case (44%), and some (23%) indicated that their child is not friends with children in the project. Of those indicating that such friendships exist, 45% stated that their child talks to them about their friends' experiences in the project. The main topics of discussion appear to be the teachers, new friends, school subjects, and participation in school activities.

(3) If the opportunity were available, 80% of the parents would like their child to participate in Project Concern. More parents with female children (84%) than male children (74%), and parents of children at the higher grades than the lower grades favored such participation (grade 7, 88%; grade 3, 76%). Those parents favoring participation felt a "better education" and the "opportunity to meet other children" would be provided.

(4) The majority of parents favoring their child's participation in the project would like their child to attend a Suburban school (62%); 26% preferred a Non-public school and 12% preferred a Hartford school.

Some trends for differences in parental preference across grade levels and sex of the child were noted.

(5) Most parents (84%) favored Project Concern continuing in the future. While 13% were unsure, only 3% did not favor its continuation. Reasons for favoring the continuation of the program generally reflected the parent perception of a "better education" (e.g., "small classes," "more teacher attention," and "learning more") through the program.

In summary, the majority of Hartford parents without children participating in Project Concern knew about the program and favored their child's future participation, especially at a suburban school. Most of these parents favored the continuation of the project in the future. They perceived that a "better education" would be received by their child through the program.

Cautions in the Interpretation of the Results of This Survey of Hartford Parents

Two cautions should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of this survey of Hartford parents. The first caution deals with the nature of the sample of parents of Project Concern "sending" schools' students not participating in the program. Parents comprising this sample are parents of the Hartford comparison group students who participated in other components of this evaluation. One of the criteria used in selecting these students back in December 1975, was that their parents would be interested in allowing them to participate in Project Concern, if the opportunity was available. Thus, parents of Project Concern "sending" schools' students not participating in the program were parents who expressed some interest in the past in enrolling their

child in Project Concern if the opportunity was available.

The second caution is a limitation common to all survey research studies. It should be kept in mind that the results of the interviews presented describe the attitudes and opinions of these parents at the time of the interview based on responses to specific formulations of questions. Such responses are a result of the parents' individual understanding of the questions and their direct or vicarious experiences with the issues involved. From one interview, one cannot assume how the same parents would react to the same set of questions at a later point in time. Nor can one assume that they would react similarly to an interview addressed to the same issues, but with questions worded slightly differently. In short, then, the results presented must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the interview, the wording of the questions used, and the knowledge and experience of the parents surveyed.

VI. SUBURBAN PARENTS' AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PROJECT CONCERN

Background

A survey of Suburban parents' and teachers' attitudes toward Project Concern was conducted during the spring of the 1975-1976 school year. Suburban parents of children in grades 2, 4, and 6 in participating Project Concern communities were mailed a Parent Questionnaire during the last week of May 1976. These were parents of children who were in classrooms with Project Concern students. Of the 619 questionnaires mailed, 182 (30%) were returned.

Findings of the Parent Questionnaire

Of the parents responding, 97% knew their town was participating in Project Concern and 91% were aware that there were Concern students in their child's classroom. More parents liked (30%) the program than disliked (18%) the program with the dominant response falling in the mixed feelings category (43%). Parents who liked the Concern program commented that it created a situation where inner-city and suburban students could exchange cultural ideas, communicate, form relationships, and come to better understand people of different backgrounds.

Comments of Suburban parents who did not like the Concern program clustered in several areas. Some parents disliked Project Concern because it was perceived as harmful to Suburban students in two ways. First, the program meant larger classes and less teacher time for suburban children. Secondly, the discipline problems created by Concern

participants as well as the language used and stories conveyed by these students were perceived as potentially emotionally harmful to suburban students. Other parents commented that they did not like the Concern program because it violated the neighbor school concept and prevented the segregation of socio-economic classes.

Parents with mixed feelings about the Project Concern program provided a wide range of comments, some of which are summarized below:

(1) Busing meant the Project Concern child had to live in two worlds with two sets of friends. This could be difficult for the child to manage.

(2) Some Project Concern students created discipline problems while some others formed cliques. Both situations were viewed as Hartford students' expression of dissatisfaction with their suburban school experience.

(3) Some parents viewed busing as only a token effort at providing equal educational opportunity for Hartford students. Why not upgrade city schools to give more inner-city children a better education at home and attack the integration or segregation problems through other measures?

(4) Finally, some parents had mixed feelings toward Project Concern depending on where the real financial burden for the program's operation rested.

Suburban Parent Views of the Personal Relationships Between Suburban and Project Concern Children

Three items on the parent survey focus on the personal relationships between Suburban students and Project Concern participants. The majority (68%) of Suburban students made reference to the Concern pupils at least sometime, while a sizable portion (21%) make no reference to Hartford students during conversations with their parents. When asked about the types of comments their children made in reference to Concern

participants, comments varied. Some parents (18%) cited the friendly relations their child had with the Concern children. Other parents (26%) provided negative comments indicating their child did not get along with the Concern children due to the discipline problems they created. Many parents (56%) provided positive and negative or neutral comments. These parents clarified their statements by indicating that such comments were not unique to Hartford children since on occasion their child made similar references to their relations with their suburban peers.

The majority of Suburban parents (59%) perceived their children as not having a close friendship with Hartford Project Concern children. This perception is interesting in light of the fact that almost 70% of the Suburban students commented that they were friendly toward the Hartford students in their class at least most of the time.

The final item addressing the relationship between Suburban peers and Concern participants asked parents whether any Hartford Project Concern students visited their home. Only 20% of the parents indicated that Project Concern students visited their homes. In situations where Concern students did visit Suburban homes, the reasons for the visit were the same as for visits among Suburban students (i.e., to play, listen to records, birthday party, etc.) with one exception. In some instances Concern students would "stay over" or visit with a Suburban peer since transportation was not readily available for the child to return to Hartford following an after school activity.

Suburban Parent Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern

The dominant position of Suburban parents (45%) was that Project Concern should continue, 8% had no opinion and 26% were uncertain. It is interesting to compare parents' views of whether the program should continue to their perceptions of the Project Concern program. For the most part, the following trends emerged:

(1) Parents who had no opinion about the program had no opinion about its continuation.

(2) Parents who liked the program favored its continuation.

(3) Parents who disliked the program advocated its discontinuation.

(4) Most parents with mixed feelings about the program were uncertain about its continuation.

(5) Some parents with mixed feelings were optimistic about the program's effects to the extent that they favored the continuation of Project Concern, while others were pessimistic toward the effects of the program to the extent that they favored its discontinuation.

In summary, the major findings of the Suburban parent survey were as follows:

(1) The dominant view of Suburban parents was that they had mixed feelings about the Project Concern program.

(2) The majority of the Suburban parents responded that their children (1) sometime mentioned the Concern students at their school in home conversations, (2) were not close friends with the Concern participants, and (d) did not have the Concern pupils visit with them at their home.

(3) The dominant feeling of Suburban parents was that the Project Concern program should continue.

Suburban Teachers' Attitudes Toward Project Concern

Attitudes of Suburban teachers toward Project Concern were assessed using a Suburban Teacher Questionnaire mailed to teachers of Concern students at grades 2, 4, and 6 in participating Suburban Project Concern communities during the last week of May 1976. Of the 165 questionnaires mailed, 119 (72%) were returned.

Based on the responses of these teachers, the average second and fourth grade teacher participating in Project Concern has a class size of about 24 students including 2 Project Concern participants. Typical second grade teachers tended to have Project Concern participants in their classrooms for 5-6 years while fourth and sixth grade teachers have had Concern students in their classrooms for 3-4 years. The average sixth grade class is somewhat larger with 29 students, 2 of whom being Project Concern participants. It is important to note that the mean class sizes reported are inflated by about 3-4 students since some teachers involved in team or cluster arrangements reported the size of the total team or cluster with which they were working.

Suburban Teachers' Ratings of Concern Pupil Progress

In responding to the teacher survey, suburban staff were asked to rate the progress of each Project Concern student in their classroom in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, and social adjustment. These ratings were based on their view of the child's own progress rather than in comparison to other students in their classroom. Suburban teachers indicated that the majority of the Concern students at grades 2, 4, and 6 were making average progress in reading, language

arts, mathematics, and social adjustment. At grades 2 and 6, Concern students tended to be making better progress in the academic areas than in social adjustment.

Suburban Teachers' Views of the Influence of Project Concern Children on Suburban Children

The majority of the Suburban teachers felt Project Concern children did have an influence upon their Suburban classroom peers. When asked how Concern participants influenced their Suburban classroom peers, The comments of teachers were predominantly positive or mixed at each of the grade levels studied. On the positive side, one second grade teacher described the influence of Project Concern students in the following manner:

> The two boys who have been in my classes have been helpful. It has helped our children to understand how to get along with other children--that all children can teach each other, to understand each other better, and to get along harmoniously in this world. Project Concern children have had a definitely positive influence.

A fourth grade teacher felt the positive influence of Project Concern increased when there was more than one Concern child in the classroom.

> Project Concern children bring a scope of experiences widely divergent from the Suburban children in my class...intellectually, emotionally, and socially. This is most true when there are numbers of Project Concern children together. Having only one Project Concern child in a class, the influence he/she generates tends to diminish, because that child tends to act and perform as her peers act or perform.

Another teacher described the mixed effects of Project Concern pupils as follows:

> Some Project Concern children have made many close friends among local children. Some have greatly impressed (Suburban) pupils with their academic and/or athletic skills. Others have been somewhat negative in their influence, sometimes resentful toward classmates. Some have introduced language and behavior patterns that were unacceptable.

The overall view of teachers regarding the influence of Project Concern participants on Suburban classroom peers is summarized best by the following response:

> In seven years I have seen Project Concern children exhibit a very positive and beneficial attitude which was a good influence on Suburban students, and I have seen just the opposite. In general I would say the influence has been 75% good to about 25% bad.

Suburban Teachers' Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern

Teacher responses to the survey item focusing on the continuation of Project Concern are summarized below:

Do you favor the continuation of the Project Concern Program?

	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6
Yes	67	66	70
No	3	5	11
Uncertain	30	29	17

From these results, it is evident that the majority of teachers favored the continuation of Project Concern. In addition to stating

their position on the continuation of Project Concern, teachers were asked to explain why they adopted their particular stance. There tended to be considerable consistency among teachers responses across the grade levels studied. As indicated by the following statements teachers favoring the continuation of Project Concern did so on the basis of the perceived cultural, social, and academic efforts of the program.

(1) I believe Suburban--usually not minority--students need exposure to minority peers in order to understand differences as well as similarities. The social interaction is most important and after-school, extracurricular opportunities are essential. Busing should of course, be completely voluntary.

(2) I believe in equal education for all and though there are flaws in this program, it is the best way to insure equality at the moment. Broadens perspectives of both (our students) and Concern students.

(3) It provides a place and opportunity for intercultural learning that otherwise might not happen.

(4) By having young children associate with children from various backgrounds and homes I feel the prejudices formed or developed because of preconceived ideas adults have and impart to their children can be done away with. This is true for families from the city and the suburbs.

Teachers who were uncertain as to whether Project Concern should continue had some reservation about the academic impact of the program and also forsaw the potential of some negative social side effects. The following teacher statements are representative of some of these points of view.

(1) I do not believe that the students involved in a Project Concern program achieve any significant academic growth that could not be achieved in schools of their respective areas.

(2) For some students it seems to be washing well, for others it appears to be a failure. They have not progressed well academically, I feel that some wish they were back in Hartford.

(3) It seems removing children from their neighborhood environments, placing (them) into another setting and then removing them from this and returning them to their home environment could be confusing to the total development of the children.

Teachers not favoring the continuation of Project Concern felt the program was not effective either academically, socially, or as a means of racial integration. The following teacher quotes illustrate these points.

(1) I am not certain if this is the best for the children. They see what they don't have and possibly resent it. We cannot change the environment they have to go back to every day after school. I believe everyone deserves the best, but I'm wondering if they would do just as well academically in their neighborhood school.

(2) I do feel the children gain academically, but not much progress has been made socially. A great amount of money is spent on a few.

(3) This is the only way at present Hartford and the suburban towns can achieve some degree of integration in the schools. It is a poor way. A better way would be to build moderate and low cost housing in all suburban towns.

Before concluding this discussion, it is interesting to look at the crossbreak below comparing teacher perceptions on the program

continuation oriented item with the prior item focusing on the influence of Concern students on Suburban classroom peers.

		Do you favor the continuation of Project Concern?		
		Yes	No	Uncertain
Do you feel Project Concern children have an influence upon the Suburban children in your class?	Yes	46%	3%	15%
	No	21%	3%	10%

It is particularly interesting to note the large percent (21%) of teachers who felt Concern students did not influence Suburban children, but would still want the program to continue.

Suburban Teachers' Views of Areas Where the Project Concern Program Can Be Improved

Suburban teachers were asked the open-ended question of how they felt the Project Concern program could be improved. Suggestions for improvement tended to cluster into four areas: (1) transportation, (2) parent-teacher contact, (3) selection of Concern participants, and (4) guidance.

In summary, the major findings of the Suburban Teacher Survey are as follows:

(1) For the most part, the majority of Suburban teachers at grades 2, 4, and 6 perceived Concern participants as exhibiting average progress in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, and social adjustment.

(2) Most Suburban teachers felt Concern participants did have an influence upon the Suburban students in their classrooms. Regarding the

nature of this influence, the comments of teachers were predominently positive or mixed at each of the grade levels studied.

(3) Few Suburban teachers felt that the Project Concern program should be discontinued.

(4) Suburban teachers felt the Project Concern program should be improved in the areas of (1) transportation, (2) parent-teacher contact, (3) participant selection, and (4) student guidance.

Limitations of the Reported Perceptions of Suburban Parents and Teachers Toward Project Concern

In reviewing the reported perceptions of Suburban parents and teachers toward Project Concern, it is important to note the precautions regarding the use of survey results stated earlier in Section V. In summary, the parent and teacher survey results must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the survey, the wording of the questions used, and the knowledge and experience of the parents and teachers surveyed. Furthermore, the 30% return rate for the Parent Questionnaire sheds some question on the generalizability of the results obtained. Given this return rate, one cannot be certain as to whether the results presented are representative of (1) the Suburban parent population surveyed, or (2) that portion of the Suburban parent population which due to some strong convictions wished to make its position known.

CONCLUDING REMARKS
ON THE USE OF THIS FIVE YEAR SYNTHESIS OF
PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION FINDINGS

The major intent of this synthesis was to summarize what we have learned about the impact of the Hartford Project Concern Program through evaluation efforts over the past five years. These findings must be interpreted in light of the evaluation design utilized as well as any precautions or limitations noted. In some instances, the reader of this synthesis may wish to refer back to the original evaluation reports for a more complete discussion of those findings which are critical in making decisions about the future direction of Project Concern.

This synthesis has been prepared to aid Hartford Public Schools personnel in assessing the effectiveness of Project Concern. Many have asked whether Project Concern is working. In attempting to answer this question, it is important to first define what "works" means. More specifically, it is important to define and prioritize the current objectives for Project Concern. Then the results presented in this synthesis can be used to determine the extent to which these objectives can be achieved.